SOME MIS-ATTRIBUTED FLEUR-DE-LIS COINS OF HAROLD I

By R. H. M. DOLLEY

In the early summer of 1963 Mr. C. S. S. Lyon and I were engaged on a full-scale investigation of the so-called Jewel Cross coinage in the names of Harold and of Harthacnut, and at one point in our researches it became desirable for me to draw up a reasonably complete and accurate roster of the mints and moneyers striking for Harold in the immediately ensuing Fleur-de-lis issue. In the course of preparing this list I happened on a number of corrections to Hildebrand which seem not to have been made before, and in this paper they will be set out seriatim so that readers of the Journal may judge for themselves whether they have been arrived at on grounds that are reasoned or are perhaps no more than capricious. It is only fair to say, too, that in a number of them I would seem to have been anticipated by the late Dr. G. C. Brooke, that is if we accept the negative evidence of the omission of certain names from the lists of moneyers on pp. 69-78 of English Coins, but the non-survival of the notes he made in the course of his visit to Scandinavia in 1933, after the appearance of the book in question, means that there is now no way of knowing to what extent his probably intuitive corrections were justified by solid evidence. To facilitate the marking up of copies of Anglosachsiska mynt, the coins discussed are given in the order of their Hildebrand numbers.

Hild. 74. (cf. Pl. IX, 1 & 2)

Hildebrand transcribed the reverse legend +ÆLFHERE ON COL, but Ælfhere is not otherwise known as a Colchester moneyer at this period, and significantly Brooke omits his name. In his 1941 British Numismatic Journal paper, however, Turner included the coin as no. 98 of his ‘corpus’ of the pennies of the Colchester mint, and hence the need that it should be once and for all dissociated from an Essex context. As the plate should show, Hild. 74 is a misread coin of York where Ælfhere is a well-attested moneyer in the period and type, and in fact it has proved to be from the same dies as Hild. 147, a coin the York attribution of which has never been doubted.

Hild. 86 (cf. Pl. IX, 3 & 4)

Hildebrand’s transcription of the reverse legend is +ÆLHFINE ON DEO, but the Derby attribution is not perpetuated in Brooke. Ælfwine was not a Derby moneyer at this period, but is known for Thetford. A check has established that the coin under discussion is from the same obverse die as Hild. 937, a coin which incontestably is of the Thetford mint.

Hild. 180 (cf. Pl. IX, 5 & 6)

The reverse legend was read by Hildebrand as +GODMAN ON DEO, and Godman duly appears as a York moneyer of Harold I on p. 78 of Brooke’s English Coins. It is true that a Godman had struck at York throughout the preceding reign, but a check has revealed that the Harold coin is from the same reverse die as Hild. 293 which Hildebrand very properly assigned to Hertford. A coin such as Hild. 294 with mint-signature IÆOR leaves no room for doubt that Godman was a Hertford moneyer under Harold, and it is to Hertford that Hild. 180 should now be assigned.
Hild. 266 (cf. Pl. IX, 7 & 8)

Hildebrand's reading of the reverse legend +PULPINE ON GEA was doubtless influenced by the circumstances that Wulfwine is a well-attested Cambridge moneyer in this very type. The coin, however, proves to be mis-struck, and Wulfwine is no less prolific a moneyer of the type at Bristol. A routine check is sufficient to establish that Hild. 266 and Hild. 36 are from the same dies, while from the plate it should be clear that the mint-signature is to be read BRIC (for Bristol) and not GEA (for Cambridge).

Hild. 306. (Pl. IX, 9 & A)

Hildebrand read the reverse legend +SAEDMAN ON HER, and gave the coin to Hereford. Brooke, clearly unhappy, took the easy course and omitted 'Sædman' from the canon of Hereford moneyers without suggesting an alternative attribution. Examination of the actual coin has supplied the answer to the puzzle. The name of the moneyer should be read SÆDMAN for Sideman, and Sideman is a moneyer peculiarly associated at this period with the mint of Wareham. It is hoped that the enlargements will make it clear that the coin under discussion is in fact of Wareham, the mint-signature reading not HER but PER. The correction is one that is not without interest for the Dorset specialist inasmuch as one consequence is that now for the first time Wareham appears as a mint of Harold I.

Hild. 336 (Pl. IX, 10 & 11)

Hildebrand's transcription of the reverse legend is +CYLDEPINE O LE, but it is not surprising that Gyldewine should fail to be cited by Brooke as one of the moneyers of the Chester mint. At Canterbury Gyldewine is a prolific moneyer at this very period, and an examination of the coin establishes that the mint-signature is not LE (for Chester) but CE (for Canterbury). Suspicion becomes certainty when it is discovered that the penny in question is in fact a die-duplicate of Hild. 46.

Hild. 983 (cf. Pl. IX, 12–14)

The reverse legend is transcribed by Hildebrand as +SPERTNC ON FE, and the coin given to Wallingford. Swertinc, however, is not otherwise known for the Berkshire mint, and Brooke's omission of the name from the canon of Wallingford moneyers seems justified on purely circumstantial grounds. Swertinc, however, is a singularly well-attested moneyer at Derby, and a check establishes that the coin under discussion is a die-duplicate of Hild. 95—and from the same obverse die as Hild. 959 the attribution of which to Thetford, passed over by Brooke and revived by Carson in the 1949 Numismatic Chronicle (p. 221), was again rejected by Miss G. van der Meer in Anglo-Saxon Coins (p. 181).

Hild. 1025/6/7 (cf. Pl. IX, 15–17 & 20 & 21)

The three coins with mint-signatures recorded by Hildebrand as PINE, PII and PIN are all by the moneyer Le(o)fstan and are from two obverse and three reverse dies. Brooke accepted Leofstan as a Winchester moneyer of Harold I, and we may presume him to have been influenced by the circumstance that a Leofstan had struck at Winchester for Cnut while a moneyer of the same name is assigned to the mint early in the reign of Edward the Confessor (cf. BMC Edw. Conf. 1369). If, however, we look more closely into the problem, we find that there is only one late penny of Cnut attributable to Winchester (Hild. 3785), and here the mint-signature is recorded as PIN. Leofstan, however, is a Worcester moneyer at precisely this period, and a check establishes that Hild. Cnut 3785 is from the same obverse die as Hild. Cnut 3636 where the mint-signature appears as PÎHR, a form which can only denote
Worcester. In the same way it must be observed that BMC Edw. Conf. 1369 has the quite ambiguous mint-signature PI. From this it is clear that the Harold coins with mint-signatures recorded as PINE, PII and PIN form a little group on their own. They are unconnected with any coin which is undoubtedly of Winchester, and an examination establishes that the mint-signature of Hild. 1025 is PINE, as impeccable a mint-signature for Worcester as PINE is inexact for Winchester, while on Hild. 1027 the mint-signature can as well be read PII (for Worcester) as PIN (for Winchester). We are left with Hild. 1026, with ambiguous mint-signature PI (or PH?), and a check has established that it is from the same dies as Hild. 988 which Hildebrand gave—quite rightly—to Worcester. It may be accepted, then, that Leofstan is not a Winchester moneyer of Harold I, and the three coins can now all be associated with Worcester where Leofstan is found at precisely this period employing such incontrovertible mint-signatures as PHRA, PHERC etc.

Hild. 1031/1032 (cf. Pl. IX, 18 & 19)

The two coins are recorded by Hildebrand as having mint-signatures PINC and PIN. Both are by a moneyer Luf(e)ric, and the entry Leofric under Winchester suggests that Brooke was prepared to admit them to the canon of the moneyers of the West Saxon capital. However, it should be observed that Leofric is not otherwise recorded as a moneyer of Winchester, while it is noteworthy that a moneyer spelling his name Luf(e)ric strikes at Worcester for Cnut and Harthacnut (cf. Hild. Cnut 3638 & 3639) and also for Edward the Confessor (cf. Hild. Edw. Conf. 756). Without the least hesitation, therefore, Hild. 1031 & 1032 can now be assigned to Worcester, and the name of Leofric deleted from the list of Winchester moneyers of Harold I.

As already remarked, the need for some of the above re-attributions would seem to have been appreciated by Brooke, but even so there are a number that necessitate five emendations to the relevant pages of English Coins. For the convenience of the general reader they are here summarized in the order of the mint-entries on pp. 69-78.

P. 77. wareham, Sideman, Add Hi.
Ibid. WINCHESTER, Delete Leofric (Hi).
Ibid. WINCHESTER, Leofstan. Delete Hi.
Ibid. worcester, Leofric. Add Hi.
P. 78 YORK, Godman. Delete Hi.

It only remains for me to thank the authorities of the Royal Swedish Coin Cabinet for the direct photographs which make up the plate, and for permission to publish here yet another instalment of the preliminary work in connection with the publication of the Viking-age coin-hoards of Sweden.

KEY TO PLATE IX

(1) Hild. 74  (12) Hild. 983
(2) Hild. 147  (13) Hild. 95
(3) Hild. 86  (14) Hild. 959
(4) Hild. 937  (15) Hild. 1025
(5) Hild. 180  (16) Hild. 1026
(6) Hild. 293  (17) Hild. 1027
(7) Hild. 266  (18) Hild. 1031
(8) Hild. 36  (19) Hild. 1032
(9) Hild. 306 (see also A)  (20) Hild. Cnut 3785
(10) Hild. 336  (21) Hild. Cnut 3836
(11) Hild. 46  (A) Hild. 306 (see also 9).
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